

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 21 2006****REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending, with claims 1, 15 and 23 being independent claims. Each of the rejections is addressed below.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st Paragraph

The Examiner claims that the term "a procedure" added to claim 1 is not supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification, at page 4, lines 19-25 and page 10, lines 3-19 are examples of "a procedure from the government of government agent" as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants therefore request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 as indefinite on the basis that "procedure" is not supported by the specification. Applicants have shown above that the specification does in fact support the claim term "procedure," and therefore request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 15-22 as being indefinite and claims that it is unclear how the data entered, computer memories, and computers are related. Applicants have amended claims to show that the first computer interface is linked to the second computer interface, which are in different countries. Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection has been overcome and therefore request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 23-26 Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Applicants assert has amended the claims to further clarify the claims so the government official will issue an instruction from the group consisting of customs, immigration, and no further processing. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection has been overcome and therefore request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-13, and 15-22 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-13, and 15-22 have been rejected as anticipated by Marjo. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. With regards to claim 1, Marjo is devoid of any

disclosure of "entering information identifying the passenger a second time into a computer before departure and verifying an identity of the passenger." At most, Marjo discloses that information identifying the passenger is entered into a computer only once so as to prepare the passenger manifest against which the passenger image will be checked. The Examiner appears to be interchanging the taking of an image with the entering of information into a computer. While the passenger's image is taken a second time for comparison when the passenger is picking up keys, which, unlike claim 1, occurs after departure, there is no disclosure of suggestion of identifying information having been entered a second time into a computer before departure.

Marjo also fails to disclose many of the limitations of independent claim 15. Specifically, Marjo lacks at least the following claim limitations: "a second computer memory linked to the first computer interface, wherein a user transfers data concerning the international passenger from the first computer memory to the second computer memory"; "a customs form stored in at least one computer memory"; "information from a passport of the passenger is entered into the second computer memory"; "the passenger fills out a customs form and stores said form into a computer memory, and a record from a baggage inspection of the baggage of the international passenger is stored in at least one computer memory"; "second means for entering information concerning the international passenger into at least one computer memory, said second means linked to the second computer interface"; and "wherein information from a passport of the passenger is entered into a memory of the second computer interface and an instruction for the passenger is printed at the immigration counter." Because Marjo clearly fails to disclose every limitation found in the claim 15, the Office Action fails to make out a prima facie case of anticipation.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 15 are patentable and request that the rejections under section 102(a) be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, and 5-14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 16-22 depend from claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 21 2006

Rejection of Claims 10, 11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

These claims depend from independent claim 1. As Applicants have shown above, claim 1 is patentable, and therefore claims 10, 11 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reason. Therefore, these rejections are moot.

Rejection of Claims 23-24 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 23-24 as anticipated by Pugliese in view of Sweatte. Applicants first note that this rejection appears to be incorrect.